Remarks

Reconsideration of the application is urged in view of the amendments above and comments which follow.

The Examiner has allowed claims 19 through 21, and indicated the allowability of the subject matter of claims 2-5 and 14-17. The above amendments therefore adopt the allowable subject matter, with some very slight changes as appropriate, as explained in the paragraphs immediately following.

Claim 1 has been amended to include the subject matter of claim 2, and claim 2 has been cancelled. Claim 1 is now identical to former claim 19, which has been cancelled.

Claim 2 has been cancelled because its allowable subject matter has been incorporated into amended claim 1.

Claim 3 has been amended to change its dependency from now-cancelled claim 2 to claim 1.

Claim 4 has been amended to delete the superfluous "mean".

Claim 5 remains unchanged.

Claim 6 has been amended to delete the superfluous "means", and claim 7 has been amended to change "beam generating means" to "a beam generator", to be consistent with the other claims.

Claims 8 and 9 remains as originally filed.

Claim 10 has been amended to delete the reference to claim 6, and, instead, incorporate that subject matter as added material.

Claim 11, like claim 7, has been amended to change "beam generating means" to "beam generator".

Claim 12 has been similarly amended.

Claims 13 and 14 remain as originally filed.

Claim 15 has some simple clarifying amendments which have not changed its scope.

Claim 16 remains as original.

Claim 17 has had its dependency changed from claim 11 to claim 14 in order to have a proper change of dependency.

Claim 18 remains as it was previously amended, and claim 19 has been cancelled, as indicated above.

Claim 20 has been allowed by the Examiner and a simple change has been made to replace "controlled" by "controllable" to properly correspond to the preceding language in claim.

Claim 21 has been amended, like claim 7, to change "beam generating means" to "beam generator". New claims 22 through 28 correspond, respectively, to claims 7, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15 and 16, but dependent upon allowed claim 20.

New claims 29 and 30 correspond, respectively, to claims 15 and 16, but depending from allowed claim 21.

Finally, new claim 31 is a combination of the subject matter of claims 1, 7, 11 and 17 which, as indicated by the Examiner, is combination of allowable subject matter. New claims 32 through 36 correspond, respectively, to claims 12 through 16, but dependent upon allowable new claim 31.

It is therefore submitted that the claims, as set forth above, are in condition for allowance since the claims either adopt the allowable subject matter as indicated by the Examiner or are claims that have already been indicated to be allowed. While the number of claims has increased, that is simply because of dependencies and the combination of the allowable subject matter of claims 1, 7, 11 and 17 which constitutes new claim 31.

Further action on the application and a Notice of Allowance in due course are solicited.

An appropriate Petition for Extension of Time is also submitted herewith.

March 10, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

William M. Lee, Jr. `Registration No. 26,935

Barnes & Thornburg

P.O. Box 2786

Chicago, Illinois 60690-2786

(312) 214-4800

(312) 759-5646 (fax)

CHDS01 WLEE 322535v1